In an Office Action dated February 26, 2008, the Examiner objected to the drawings

under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) because the subject matter recited in claim 10, namely, the feed lines

for hydraulic fluid, were not shown in the drawings. The Examiner rejected claims 8 and 10–12

under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Gentzsch (EP 1,158,181). Claims 9 and 13

were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gentzsch in view of

Campbell (U.S. 4,854,384). Claims 14-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Campbell in view of Gentzsch.

Objection to Drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a)

Claim 10, which contained the reference to feed lines, has been cancelled.

Rejection of Claims 8 and 10–12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Examiner states that Gentzsch discloses a hydraulic cylinder in which the motor (2)

and hydraulic pump (3) "are situated at least partially within the piston head." However, from

Figure 1 in Gentzsch it is evident that pump 3 is connected to an electric motor 2 positioned

within a housing 1. The piston head 4 is an annular shaped piston head connected through an

extension part 6 to a piston rod 7 and arranged to move within chamber 5, 5a. Chamber 5, 5a is

partly formed by an outside surface of pump 3. Therefore, there will be relative movement

between pump 3, electric motor 2, housing 1, piston head 4, extension part 6, and piston rod 7

when piston head 4 is moved within chamber 5, 5a.

Because of this relative movement between pump 3 and piston head 4 when operating the

hydraulic cylinder, pump 3 cannot be considered to be situated within a part forming piston head

5 {725440;}

Application No.: 10/531,739

Amendment Dated: May 19, 2008

Reply to Office Action of: February 26, 2008

4. Gentzsch, therefore, is not similar to the Applicant's invention. In the Applicant's invention,

the power unit is situated within the parts forming the piston head 4 and rod 5 and will, therefore,

move with the piston head 4 and rod 5 as they move within the chamber relative to the housing.

Rejection of Claims 9 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Gentzsch in view of Campbell does not disclose or suggest the hydraulic power unit

being situated at least partly within the parts forming the piston head or the piston rod. As

discussed above, the prior art discloses a hydraulic power unit attached to the housing. Because

of this arrangement, there is relative movement between the hydraulic power unit and the piston

head and rod during operation of the hydraulic cylinder.

The Applicant's unique structure achieves a benefit not provided for in Gentzsch in view

of Campbell. When the hydraulic cylinder is used as a plug, all lines necessary to operate the

hydraulic cylinder will be located within the piston head and rod combination or can be run out

of the plug and through the rod. A person of ordinary skill in the art would recognize the

requirement for feed lines and, therefore, would recognize the Applicant's feature as an

advantage. See Specification, p.4, ln. 27–32.

Rejection of Claims 14–19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 14–19 have been cancelled. A new claim, claim 20, has been added that depends

from clam 8. Campbell in view of Gentzsch does not render claim 20 obvious because the prior

art in combination does not disclose or suggest the hydraulic power unit being situated at least

partly within the parts forming the piston head or the piston rod. As noted above, because of the

Applicant's unique structure, when the hydraulic cylinder is used as a plug, all lines necessary to

6 {725440;}

Application No.: 10/531,739

Amendment Dated: May 19, 2008

Reply to Office Action of: February 26, 2008

operate the hydraulic cylinder will be located within the piston head and rod combination or can

be run out of the plug and through the rod.

Conclusion

Claim 8 defines a unique invention not anticipated by Gentszch and should be allowed.

Because claims 11 and 12 depend from claim 8, claims 11 and 12 should be allowed. Claims 9

and 13 are not rendered obvious by Gentzsch in view of Cambell and should be allowed. New

dependent claim 20 is not rendered obvious by Campbell in view of Gentzsch and should be

allowed.

The Applicant does not believe that any additional fee is due with the filing of this paper.

If any additional fee is due, please debit Deposit Account 50-1971. Any overpayment should be

credited to that same account.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul E. Rossler

Date: May 19, 2008

Registration No. 60,409

PTO Customer No. 28,827

GABLE GOTWALS

100 West 5th St., 10th Floor

Tulsa, OK 74103

Tel: (918) 595-4963

Fax: (918) 595-4990

E-mail: *iplaw@gablelaw.com* 

7 {725440;}